

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-19 and 21-44 are pending. No claims are being amended, cancelled or newly added. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-19, 21-23, 25-30, and 33-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2004/0066744 A1 (“Jones”) in view of U.S. Patent No. US 7,168,035 B1 (“Bell”).

Claims 9, 24, 31, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Jones and Bell in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2004/0268304 A1 (“Kuo”).

Claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 25, 28, and 33

Claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 25, 28, and 33 recite suggesting one or more changes to a user which would correct the identified non-conforming structural aspect, the suggested one or more changes being presented to the user in a predetermined suggestion template corresponding to a specific validation error, the predetermined suggestion template including logic necessary to implement the one or more changes to the document to correct the identified non-conforming structural aspect.

In rejecting this claim limitation, the examiner relies upon paragraph #0034 of Jones for teaching “suggesting one or more changes to a user which would correct the identified structural aspect” (Office Action mailed September 18, 2007, page 3). The cited portion of Jones reads as follows:

Error data 235 includes data returned to the word-processor 120 from XML validation engine 225 when an error has occurred with relation to elements validated by XML validation engine 225. Error data 235 may also include information for displaying a notification of the errors by word-processor 120. In one embodiment, four separate types of errors are reported by word-processor 120 when an error results from validation. The four types of errors include a location error, an invalid contents error, a missing contents error, and an invalid attribute error. Different types of errors may also be used other than the four described.

Designating the error as a certain type of error simplifies the analysis that must be performed to rectify the error. Error data 235 may also include further information related to the error, such as suggestions about how to possibly rectify the error which may be displayed to the user. Display and relation of error information is described further with respect to FIG. 8.

Additionally, on page 4 of the Office Action, the examiner indicates that “Jones does not specifically teach the use of the predetermined suggestion template. Bell teaches the use of the predetermined suggestion template” (emphasis added). The cited portion of Bell (col. 5, lines 21-28), reads as follows:

In block 406 of method 400, an XML data structure is presented on a user interface to a user. The XML data structure is visually presented as a hierarchical arrangement of nodes in a tree structure. Each node can be hierarchically above or below one or more nodes. The XML data structure can be associated with annotations for an XML Schema (or “XSD”). This association is seen in FIGS. 3-4 as XML Data Structure with XSD annotation 302.

The applicant respectfully submits that the examiner failed to reject the applicant's claims in their entirety. Claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 25, 28, and 33 recite suggesting one or more changes to a user which would correct the identified non-conforming structural aspect, the suggested one or more changes being presented to the user in a predetermined suggestion template corresponding to a specific validation error, the predetermined suggestion template including logic necessary to implement the one or more changes to the document to correct the identified non-conforming structural aspect.

The applicant respectfully submits that the examiner's statement that Bell simply teaches a predetermined suggestion template does not disclose or suggest a predetermined suggestion template corresponding to a specific validation error where the predetermined suggestion template includes logic necessary to implement one or more changes to a document in order to correct an identified non-conforming structural aspect in the document.

More specifically, Bell teaches a means by which “a designer uses a forms designer application to build electronic forms from hierarchical data” (Bell, Abstract). Additionally, Bell teaches the display of hierarchical data, the facilitation of the selection of a portion of the hierarchical data, and the display of one or more transformation-language components associated with the selected portion of hierarchical data. Finally, Bell teaches the generation of an

electronic form from the transformation-language components selected by the designer (Bell, Abstract).

The applicant respectfully submits the suggested transformation language components cited by the examiner to teach a predetermined suggestion template are merely suggestions to be used by a designer when generating an electronic form. These suggestions have nothing to do with specific validation errors and they do not in any way include the logic necessary to implement one or more changes to a document in order to correct an identified non-conforming structural aspect in the document.

Moreover, though Jones teaches “error data [which] may also include further information related to the error, such as suggestions about how to possibly rectify the error which may be displayed to the user” (Jones, paragraph #0034), Jones does not in any way disclose that the suggestions are shown in the predetermined suggestion template and are associated with specific validation errors. Jones merely provides “suggestions about how to possibly rectify the error”, which is not a suggestion that includes the logic necessary to implement one or more changes to a document in order to correct an identified non-conforming structural aspect in the document. In other words, suggestions to possibly rectify an error does not disclose or suggest the capacity of the suggestion template to correct that error. In contrast, the claimed suggestion template includes the logic necessary to implement a change in a document to correct a specific error (e.g., a non-conforming structural aspect).

Moreover, the applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in the Office Action mailed September 18, 2007, does the examiner specifically identify art to address the portion of the applicant’s claim language requiring that the predetermined suggestion template corresponds to a specific validation error where the predetermined suggestion template includes logic necessary to implement one or more changes to a document in order to correct an identified non-conforming structural aspect in the document.

Thus, the applicant respectfully submits that the examiner did not in fact reject claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 25, 28, and 33 in their entirety. Additionally, as set forth above, the references of Jones and Bell cited by the examiner do not disclose or suggest a predetermined suggestion template corresponding to a specific validation error where the predetermined suggestion

template includes logic necessary to implement one or more changes to a document in order to correct an identified non-conforming structural aspect in the document.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from or correspond to independent claims 1, 10, 13, 16, 25, 28, and 33 and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests that all pending claims be allowed.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting come particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 19, 2007

/Arriènne M. Lezak/

Arriènne Lezak

Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No. 21876

Fish & Richardson P.C.

Telephone: (650) 839-5070

Facsimile: (650) 839-5071